



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/963,807

09/26/2001

Roger Lee Buis

BLD920010012US1 (0525)

1170

62626

7590

09/22/2006

DAVID W. LYNCH
CHAMBLISS, BAHNER & STOPHEL
1000 TALLAN BUILDING-T
TWO UNION SQUARE
CHATTANOOGA, TN 37402

EXAMINER

QIN, YIXING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/963,807

Applicant(s)

BUIS ET AL.

Examiner

Yixing Qin

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

In response to applicant's amendment received 06/30/2006, all requested changes have been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/30/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument is that the XSL stylesheet goes through two main steps when formatting an XML document. The steps are the producing of a source tree by matching specific patterns in the XML document and then creates a results tree that gets formatted into an HTML document. However, the applicant's invention performs the formatting and printing of an XML document in two steps as well. In Fig. 5, item 542 and 550, the PSF searches for formatting instructions, then in step 554 and 570, actual formatting occurs and formatted data is sent to the printer. (Page 20, line 17-page 21 line 7 of the applicant's specification.) If this is interpreted to be a "single step" in which searching and formatting occurs, then the XSL stylesheet's way of formatting can also be considered a single step in which searching and formatting occurs. Please see the rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 2625

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 40. calls for a buffer for storing start tags in order as the XML file is parsed, wherein the parser removes the previous start tag identified as matching a qualified tag when an end tag is found. However, the applicant's specification only discloses on page 19, lines 22-23 that the PSF 450 must buffer the XML start tags to have a current QT, but does not state that the previous start tags are removed when an end tag is encountered. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

I. Claims 30-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,343) in view of XSL Example.

Regarding claims 30, 35, 41 and 47, Brooke et al discloses in column 3, lines 17-20 and column 6, lines 10-31 a description of how XSL is a formatting template for an XML file.

It does not explicitly disclose Brooke does not disclose any XSL code and thus does not disclose the various tags as claimed.

However, XSL Example discloses a formatting template for printing XML files, comprising a data map wherein the data map comprises at least one XML Descriptor (XMD) defining formatting for an XML data element, the XMDs being associated with a qualified tag formed by a concatenation of XML start tags parsed from an XML document (The code line `<xsl:template match = "TITLE" (or TITLE1, LIST1, TITLE2, LIST2, etc.)` shows the qualified tag of TITLE is what is being searched and matched to apply a formatting to that particular XML element), the XMD and qualified tags being configured to provide a format for XML data for merging in a single step with XML data to produce a data stream for printing. (Since this example shows an XSL stylesheet, the goal of the stylesheet is to format XML data for displaying or printing. As mentioned above, the searching for matches and formatting is considered to be one step)

Brooke and XSL Example are in the art of formatting an XML document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have to combined the two references because the XSL example provides more information on how to format XML documents.

The motivation would have been to enable a user to write code for formatting XSL documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brooke and XSL Example to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claims 35, 41 and 47, the XSL stylesheet processor of Brooke (column 6 lines 38-47) acts as a PSF because it facilitates the formatting of an XML file using XSL. Column 2, lines 59-67 discloses the printing of traditional SGML based applications documents for customers. Although a spooler is not disclosed, it is well-known in the printing art to have a spooler for printing.

Regarding claims 31, 36, 44, 50, Brooke et al discloses wherein the qualified tag identifies a formatting instruction that is used to format the content for an XML: data element. (column 6, line 38-47 that the XSL processor uses the XSL stylesheet to format the XML file. The qualified tag, as mentioned before in the XSL Example would be the TITLE tag, which one can see from the code would identify the formatting instructions for the TITLE element of the XML file.)

Regarding claim 32, 37, 45, 51, Brooke et al discloses wherein the qualified tag is generated whenever a start tag is encountered when parsing a XML document. (column 6, lines 50-54 that the "templates for the particular source elements that are part of the tree" could represent both qualified tags and start tags being, which are being generated and modified as elements are added to the tree.)

Regarding claim 33, 38, Brooke et al discloses in column 3, lines 17-20 and column 6, lines 10-31 a description of how XSL is a formatting template for an XML file.

It does not explicitly disclose "wherein the data map comprises a chain of XML descriptors for formatting attributes of XML elements, wherein the attributes are broken into fields."

However, XML Example shows that the <> act as delimiters to separate the various XML descriptors.

Brooke and XSL Example are in the art of formatting an XML document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the two references because the XSL example provides more information on how to format XML documents.

The motivation would have been to enable a user to write code for formatting XSL documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brooke and XSL Example to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claim 34, 39, 46, 52, Brooke et al discloses in column 3, lines 17-20 and column 6, lines 10-31 a description of how XSL is a formatting template for an XML file.

It does not explicitly disclose "wherein an XML descriptor that does not have a matching qualified tag is skipped and a next XML descriptor matching a start tag is used in formatting the XML data."

However, XML Example shows each template match has a value associated with it. It is an inherent aspect of the programming language, however, to skip values that are not matched and continue on to the next value and/or give an error message in the process.

Brooke and XSL Example are in the art of formatting an XML document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the two references because the XSL example provides more information on how to format XML documents.

The motivation would have been to enable a user to write code for formatting XSL documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brooke and XSL Example to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding claims 42, 43, 48, 49, Brooke et al discloses in column 3, lines 17-20 and column 6, lines 10-31 a description of how XSL is a formatting template for an XML file.

It does not explicitly disclose "further comprising determining whether the/processing until the end of the document has been reached.

However, The XSL stylesheet is used to parse the XML document. Although these two claims are not explicitly disclosed, the Examiner would like to point out that the goal of the XSL stylesheet is to parse the XML file by going through it and looking for the appropriate tag. Thus, the parsing of elements until an end of document is reached is an inherent feature in this environment since the entire XML file has to be parsed and processed according to an XSL file that is looking for which tags in the XML file to process.

Brooke and XSL Example are in the art of formatting an XML document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have to combined the two references because the XSL example provides more information on how to format XML documents.

The motivation would have been to enable a user to write code for formatting XSL documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Brooke and XSL Example to obtain the invention as specified.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yixing Qin whose telephone number is (571)272-7381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Lamb can be reached on (571)272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YQ


TWYLER LAMB
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER